arXiv:1512.05321v1 [q-fin.MF] 16 Dec 2015

Forward rate models with linear volatilities

Michał Barski *
Faculty of Mathematics, Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw, Poland
Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Leipzig, Germany
Michal.Barski@math.uni-leipzig.de

Jerzy Zabczyk
Institute of Mathematics, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland
zabczyk@impan.pl

December 17, 2015

Abstract

Existence of solutions to the Heath-Jarrow-Morton equation of the bond market with linear volatility and general Lévy random factor is studied. Conditions for existence and non-existence of solutions in the class of bounded fields are presented. For the existence of solutions the Lévy process should necessarily be without the Gaussian part and without negative jumps. If this is the case then necessary and sufficient conditions for the existence are formulated either in terms of the behavior of the Lévy measure of the noise near the origin or the behavior of the Laplace exponent of the noise at infinity.

Key words: bond market, HJM condition, linear volatitlity, random fields.

AMS Subject Classification: 60G60, 60H20, 91B24 91B70.

JEL Classification Numbers: G10,G12.

1 Introduction

We are concerned with the bond market model, on a fixed time interval $[0, T^*]$, $T^* < \infty$, in which the bond prices $P(t,T)$, $0 \leq t \leq T \leq T^*$, are defined on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t), t \in [0,T^*], P)$ and represented in the form

$$P(t,T) = e^{-\int_t^T f(t,u)du}, \qquad t \leq T \leq T^*.$$

Thus $P(t,T)$ is the price at moment t of the bond which matures at moment T and pays 1 to the owner. The forward curves processes $f(t,T)$, $0 \leq t \leq T \leq T^*$, are Itô processes with stochastic differentials

$$df(t,T) = \alpha(t,T)dt + \sigma(t,T)dL(t), \qquad (t,T) \in \mathcal{T}, \tag{1.1}$$

*The paper was supported by The Polish MNiSW grant $NN201419039$. The second author was supported by the European Transfer of Knowledge project SPADE2.

where

$$\mathcal{T} := \left\{(t,T) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0 \le t \le T \le T^*\right\}, \tag{1.2}$$

and the random factor L is a real Lévy process. This way of bond prices modelling with L replaced by a Wiener process was first introduced by Heath, Jarrow and Morton in [12]. The discounted bond price process is defined by

$$\hat{P}(t,T) := e^{-\int_0^t r(s)ds} \cdot P(t,T), \qquad 0 \le t \le T \le T^*,$$

where $r(t) := f(t,t),\ 0 \le t \le T^*$ is the short rate. Consequently, under the assumption that $f(t,T) = f(T,T)$ for $0 \le T < t \le T^*$, we obtain the formula

$$\hat{P}(t,T) = e^{-\int_0^T f(t,u)du}, \qquad 0 \le t \le T \le T^*.$$

For pricing purposes it is convenient, and we do this, to require that the discounted bond price processes $\hat{P}(\cdot,T)$ are local martingales on $[0,T]$.

It is of prime interest to *characterize those models for which volatility processes σ are proportional to forward processes f*, i.e.

$$\sigma(t,T) = \lambda(t,T)f(t-,T), \qquad (t,T) \in \mathcal{T}, \tag{1.3}$$

where λ is a deterministic, positive and continuous function on $\mathcal{T}$. As, for each T, $f(\cdot,T)$ is meant to be a càdlàg process then $\sigma(\cdot,T)$ is predictable.

This problem, with $\lambda(t,T) \equiv 1$, has been first stated in [16] in the case when L was a Wiener process and solved with a negative answer: linearity of volatility implies that there is no forward rate model for which (1.1)-(1.3) hold and the discounted bond price processes $\hat{P}(\cdot,T),\ T \in [0,T^*]$ are local martingales, see [16] Section 4.7 or [9] , Section 7.4. This fact was one of the main reasons that the BGM model was formulated in terms of Libor rates and not in terms of forward curves, see [5].

Let us recall, see [4], [21], [18], that the law of the process L is determined by its Laplace transform

$$\mathbf{E}(e^{-zL(t)}) = e^{tJ(z)}, \qquad t \in [0,T^*],\ z \in \mathbb{R},$$

where

$$J(z) = -az + \frac{1}{2}qz^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}} (e^{-zy} - 1 + zy\mathbf{1}_{(-1,1)}(y))\ \nu(dy), \qquad z \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{1.4}$$

with $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $q \ge 0$. The so called *Lévy measure* ν satisfies integrability condition

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} (y^2 \wedge\ 1)\ \nu(dy) < \infty, \tag{1.5}$$

and $J(z)$ is a finite number if and only if $\int_{|y|\ge 1}(e^{-zy})\ \nu(dy) < \infty$. The function J is called the *Laplace exponent* of L. The assumption that $\hat{P}(\cdot,T),\ T \in [0,T^*]$ are local martingales on $[0,T]$ implies that for each $T \in [0,T^*]$, see [3], [7], [13],

$$\int_t^T \alpha(t,u)du = J\left(\int_t^T \sigma(t,u)du\right) \tag{1.6}$$

for almost all $t \in [0,T]$. So differentiating the identity (1.6) with respect to T, and taking into account the condition (1.3) we see that proportionality of the volatility implies that the forward curve satisfies the following equation on $\mathcal{T}$,

$$df(t,T) = J'\left(\int_t^T \lambda(t,u)f(t-,u)du\right)\lambda(t,T)f(t-,T)dt + \lambda(t,T)f(t-,T)dL(t), \tag{1.7}$$

with the initial condition

$$f(0,T) = f_0(T), \quad T \in [0,T^*]. \tag{1.8}$$

The paper is concerned with existence of solutions to (1.7) - (1.8). We search for a solution in the class of random fields $f(t,T),\ (t,T) \in \mathcal{T}$ such that

$$f(\cdot,T) \text{ is adapted and càdlàg on } [0,T] \text{ for all } T \in [0,T^*], \tag{1.9}$$

$$f(t,\cdot) \text{ is continuous on } [t,T^*] \text{ for all } t \in [0,T^*], \tag{1.10}$$

$$P(\sup_{(t,T)\in\mathcal{T}} f(t,T) < \infty) = 1. \tag{1.11}$$

Random fields satisfying (1.9)-(1.11) will be called *bounded fields* on $\mathcal{T}$. We also examine a blow-up condition

$$\lim_{(t,T)\to(x,y)} f(t,T) = +\infty, \qquad (x,y) \in \mathcal{T},$$

in the class of locally bounded fields. For $(x,y) \in \mathcal{T}$ define

$$\mathcal{T}_{x,y} := \{(t,T) \in \mathcal{T} : 0 \le t \le x, 0 \le T \le y\}. \tag{1.12}$$

A random field f is called *bounded locally on* $\mathcal{T}_{x,y}$ if it is bounded on $\mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta}$ for each $0 < \delta < y$.

The results providing conditions for existence of solutions to (1.7) are of two types involving either the behavior of the function J' at infinity, see Theorems 3.3, 3.4, 3.5 or characteristics of the noise L, see Theorems 3.1, 3.2 and Proposition 4.1. In the first case if J' grows slower at infinity than a logarithm, see formula (3.4), then solution exists and if J' grows faster than the third power of a logarithm, see (3.5), then there is no solution. The method of establishing the non-existence result - Theorem 3.4, is based on the approach of Morton in [16] where the solution is compared with a deterministic blowing-up minorant. The paper [16] is sketchy and the minorant function in [16] does not satisfy all the conditions required in the proof. Therefore we provide a detailed exposition with a sequence of new auxiliary results. Let us also stress that our Theorem 3.4 treats the problem for a general class of functions J'. In the special case of bounded $J'(z), z \ge 0$ the existence result given by Theorem 3.3 can be deduced, via Musiela parametrization, from the results presented in [18]. The second group of results, involving characteristics of the noise L, is deduced from Theorem 3.3 and 3.4. It turns out that if the equation (1.7) has a solution then necessarily the process L does not have a Gaussian part and its jumps must be positive, see Theorem 3.1. If this is the case then necessary and sufficient conditions for existence are formulated in terms of the behavior of the function

$$U_\nu(x) := \int_0^x y^2\nu(dy),$$

near 0, see Theorem 3.2. An essential role here is played by a Tauberian theorem, see Theorem 2 p.445 in [8]. An existence result for integrable subordinators is formulated as Proposition 4.1.

Although there are severe restrictions on the noise required for existence of the solution nevertheless the class of models with linear volatilities allows to describe bond market with upward and downward price movements and therefore might be useful for applications.

We approached the existence problem by working with the theory of random fields because this way minimal requirements are imposed on the model. It is of great interest to compare this approach with that using stochastic partial differential equations like in the papers [10], [11], [15], [17], [18]. In the paper under preparation [2] the existence problem for forward rates with linear volatilities in the weighted spaces of square integrable functions and functions with square integrable first derivative via the theory of random fields is examined.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains preliminaries and reformulation of the problem to the more tractable form. Section 3 is devoted to the presentation of the main general results. Section 4 contains corollaries, examples and comments regarding larger class in which solution can be searched. Proofs are postponed to Section 5.

Acknowledgements
The authors thank Damir Filipović for providing a copy of [16] and a section of a book [9] which was under preparation while writing this paper. The second author thanks Szymon Peszat for a useful discussion on the subject of the paper. Constructive comments of reviewers and editors of F&S on the initial and the corrected versions of the paper are also gratefully acknowledged.

2 Model settings

Here we introduce notation and assumptions needed in the sequel and transform the equation (1.7) to a form easier to investigate.

We set the notation

$$\underline{\lambda} := \inf_{(t,T)\in\mathcal{T}} \lambda(t,T) > 0, \qquad \bar{\lambda} := \sup_{(t,T)\in\mathcal{T}} \lambda(t,T) < +\infty. \tag{2.1}$$

As we intend to work with positive forward rates we introduce the following assumptions, compare (2.4) below.

(A1) The initial curve f_0 is positive and continuous on $[0, T^*]$.

(A2) The support of the Lévy measure is contained in the interval $(-1/\bar{\lambda}, +\infty)$.

Proposition 2.1 *Assume that f is a bounded field and conditions (A1) and (A2) are satisfied. Then f is a solution of* (1.7) *if and only if*

$$f(t,T) = a(t,T)e^{\int_0^t J'\left(\int_s^T \lambda(s,u)f(s,u)du\right)\lambda(s,T)ds}, \qquad (t,T)\in\mathcal{T}, \tag{2.2}$$

where, for $(t,T)\in\mathcal{T}$,

$$a(t,T) := f_0(T)e^{\int_0^t \lambda(s,T)dL(s) - \frac{q^2}{2}\int_0^t \lambda^2(s,T)ds + \int_0^t \int_{-1/\bar{\lambda}}^{+\infty} \left(\ln(1+\lambda(s,T)y) - \lambda(s,T)y\right)\pi(ds,dy)}. \tag{2.3}$$

Proof: Let us notice, that for each T the solution $f(t,T)$, $t\in[0,T]$ of (1.7) is a stochastic exponential and therefore, see Theorem II.37 in [19], equation (1.7) can be equivalently written as

$$f(t,T) = f_0(T)\ e^{\int_0^t J'\left(\int_s^T \lambda(s,u)f(s-,u)du\right)\lambda(s,T)ds + \int_0^t \lambda(s,T)dL(s) - \frac{q^2}{2}\int_0^t \lambda^2(s,T)ds} \cdot \prod_{s\le t}(1+\lambda(s,T)\triangle L(s))e^{-\lambda(s,T)\triangle L(s)}, \qquad (t,T)\in\mathcal{T}, \tag{2.4}$$

where $\triangle L(s) = L(s) - L(s-)$. Let us recall that if L is a Lévy process then it can be decomposed into the Lévy-Itô form, see [1],

$$L(t) := at + qW(t) + \int_0^t \int_{|y|<1} y\ \hat{\pi}(ds, dy) + \int_0^t \int_{|y|\geq 1} y\ \pi(ds, dy), \tag{2.5}$$

where $a \in \mathbb{R}, q \geq 0$, W is a Wiener process, π is the Poisson random measure of jumps of L and $\hat{\pi}$ is the measure π compensated by $dt \times \nu(dy)$.

Under assumptions (A1) and (A2) we can write equation (2.4) in the form

$$f(t,T) = f_0(T)\ e^{\int_0^t J'\left(\int_s^T \lambda(s,u) f(s-,u)du\right)\lambda(s,T)ds + \int_0^t \lambda(s,T)dL(s) - \frac{q^2}{2}\int_0^t \lambda^2(s,T)ds}$$

$$\cdot\ e^{\int_0^t \int_{-1/\lambda}^{+\infty} \left(\ln(1+\lambda(s,T)y) - \lambda(s,T)y\right)\pi(ds,dy)}, \qquad (t,T) \in \mathcal{T}, \tag{2.6}$$

or equivalently as

$$f(t,T) = a(t,T) e^{\int_0^t J'\left(\int_s^T \lambda(s,u) f(s-,u)du\right)\lambda(s,T)ds}, \qquad (t,T) \in \mathcal{T}. \tag{2.7}$$

We show now that we can replace $f(s-,u)$ in (2.7) by $f(s,u)$. To do this we prove that for each $(t,T) \in \mathcal{T}$

$$\int_0^t J'\left(\int_s^T \lambda(s,u) f(s,u)du\right)\lambda(s,T)ds = \int_0^t J'\left(\int_s^T \lambda(s,u) f(s-,u)du\right)\lambda(s,T)ds.$$

Let us start with the observation that for $T \in [0, T^*]$ moments of jumps of the process $f(\cdot, T)$ are the same as for $a(\cdot, T)$. Moreover, it follows from (2.3) that the set of jumps of $a(\cdot, T)$ is independent of T and is contained in the set

$$\mathcal{Z} := \{t \in [0, T^*] : \triangle L(t) \neq 0\}.$$

Thus if $s \notin \mathcal{Z}$ then

$$J'\left(\int_s^T \lambda(s,u) f(s,u)du\right)\lambda(s,T) = J'\left(\int_s^T \lambda(s,u) f(s-,u)du\right)\lambda(s,T).$$

By Theorem 2.8 in [1] the set $\mathcal{Z}$ is at most countable, so the assertion follows. □

Remark 2.2 *As we already indicated, the formula* (2.4) *implies that models with positive forward rates must satisfy (A1) and (A2). If this is the case then, in view of* (2.2)*, only properties of the restriction of the function J' to $[0, +\infty)$ are essential for the existence results.*

As far as the coefficient function λ in the equation (2.2) is concerned, we will require that it is continuous function satisfying the following assumption.

$$(A3) \quad \begin{cases} \text{For each } 0 < t \leq T^* \text{ the process } \int_0^t \lambda(s,T)dL(s);\ T \in [t, T^*] \text{ is continuous.} \\ \\ \text{The field } \left|\ \int_0^t \lambda(s,T)dL(s)\ \right| \text{ is bounded on } \mathcal{T}. \end{cases}$$

Compare the type of boundeddness above with (1.11). The condition $(A3)$ is satisfied if, for instance, $\lambda(\cdot,\cdot)$ is constant or, more generally, if it is of the form

$$\lambda(t,T) = \sum_{n=1}^{N} a_n(t) b_n(T),$$

where $\{a_n(\cdot)\}, \{b_n(\cdot)\}$ are continuous functions. The assumption that $\lambda(\cdot,\cdot)$ is continuous does not imply, in general, (A3), see [6], [14] for counterexamples.

Proposition 2.3 *Assume that the conditions (A1), (A2), (A3) are satisfied. Then the field* $\{a(t,T);\ (t,T)\in\mathcal{T}\}$ *given by* (2.3) *is bounded from below and above by strictly positive constants depending on* ω*. Moreover,* $a(\cdot,T)$ *is adapted and càdlàg on* $[0,T]$ *for all* $T\in[0,T^*]$ *and* $a(t,\cdot)$ *is continuous on* $[t,T^*]$ *for all* $t\in[0,T^*]$*.*

Proof: The fact that $a(\cdot,T)$ is adapted and càdlàg is clear. We only need to show that

$$F(t,T,\lambda(\cdot,\cdot)) := \int_0^t \int_{-\frac{1}{\lambda}}^{+\infty} \Big(\ln(1+\lambda(s,T)y) - \lambda(s,T)y\Big)\pi(ds,dy)$$

is bounded wrt. (t,T) and continuous wrt. T. The function $x \longrightarrow \ln(1+xy)-xy$ is decreasing on $[\underline{\lambda},\bar{\lambda}]$ and thus we have

$$F(t,T,\bar{\lambda}) \le F(t,T,\lambda(\cdot,\cdot)) \le F(t,T,\underline{\lambda}).$$

The processes $F(t,T,\bar{\lambda}), F(t,T,\underline{\lambda})$ do not depend on T and have càdlàg paths in t. Therefore they are bounded wrt. t. Continuity of F wrt. T follows from the dominated convergence theorem. □

Let us focus on the function J' appearing in the equation (2.2). In virtue of (1.4), (2.5) and by the assumption (A2) the function J is given by the formula

$$J(z) = -az + \frac{1}{2}qz^2 + J_1(z) + J_2(z) + J_3(z),$$

where

$$J_1(z) := \int_{-1/\bar{\lambda}}^0 (e^{-zy} - 1 + zy)\ \nu(dy), \quad J_2(z) := \int_0^1 (e^{-zy} - 1 + zy)\ \nu(dy) \tag{2.8}$$

$$J_3(z) := \int_1^\infty (e^{-zy} - 1)\ \nu(dy). \tag{2.9}$$

Taking into account (1.5) we see that the function J is well defined for $z \ge 0$. Moreover, the condition (1.5) implies that for $z>0$ the functions J_1, J_2, J_3 have derivatives of any order, see Lemma 8.1 and 8.2 in [20]. In the equation (1.7) or equivalently in (2.2) intervene values of $J'(z)$ for *all non-negative* z. We will therefore assume that also $J'(0)$ is a finite number. But

$$J'(0) = -a + J_3'(0) = -a - \int_1^\infty y\nu(dy),$$

so we require that

$$\int_1^\infty y\nu(dy) < +\infty. \tag{2.10}$$

Thus the objective of this paper is to examine existence of solution for the equation (2.2), where

$$J'(z) = -a + qz + J_1'(z) + J_2'(z) + J_3'(z), \qquad z \ge 0,$$

and the Lévy measure ν of L is concentrated on $(-1/\bar{\lambda},0)\cup(0,+\infty)$ and satisfies the assumption

$$\text{(A4)} \qquad \int_{(-1/\bar{\lambda},1)} y^2\nu(dy) + \int_1^\infty y\nu(dy) < \infty.$$

The following properties of the function J' will be needed in the sequel.

Proposition 2.4 *i) If (A4) holds then J_1', J_2', J_3', and thus J' as well, are increasing, real-valued functions on the interval $[0, +\infty)$.*

ii) J' is a Lipschitz function on $[0, +\infty)$ if and only if

$$\int_1^\infty y^2 \nu(dy) < \infty. \tag{2.11}$$

Proof: The proof follows directly from the formulae for the derivatives of J_1, J_2, J_3 listed below, see Lemma 8.1 and 8.2 in [20]

$$J_1'(z) = \int_{-1/\bar{\lambda}}^0 y(1 - e^{-zy})\nu(dy), \quad J_2'(z) = \int_0^1 y(1 - e^{-zy})\nu(dy),$$

$$J_3'(z) = -\int_1^\infty y e^{-zy}\nu(dy), \tag{2.12}$$

$$J_1''(z) = \int_{-1/\bar{\lambda}}^0 y^2 e^{-zy}\nu(dy), \quad J_2''(z) = \int_0^1 y^2 e^{-zy}\nu(dy), \quad J_3''(z) = \int_1^\infty y^2 e^{-zy}\nu(dy). \tag{2.13}$$

□

Remark 2.5 *The conditions (A4) and (2.11) are equivalent to the, respectively, integrability and square integrability of the process L, see [21], Theorem 2.53 and Proposition 25.4 p.159.*

3 Formulation of the results

In this section we present main results providing conditions for existence and non-existence of solution of the equation (2.2). The first two results, i.e. Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2 are formulated in terms of the characteristics of the process L. Both are deduced from Theorem 3.3 and Theorem 3.4 which provide conditions for existence and non-existence of solutions in terms of the growth of the function J' at infinity. The final result is Theorem 3.5 on locally bounded solutions which were defined in Section 1. In section 4 we present a further result regarding subordinators - Proposition 4.1, which is based on the results from this section. Proofs are contained in Section 5.

In the formulation of all the results we implicitly assume that (A1), (A2), (A3), (A4) are satisfied.

The first theorem states that for existence of bounded solutions to (2.2) the Gaussian part of the noise process L must be absent and, rather unexpectedly, L must not have negative jumps.

Theorem 3.1 *If the Laplace exponent J of L is such that $q > 0$ or $\nu\{(-\frac{1}{\lambda}, 0)\} > 0$ then there are no bounded solutions to* (2.2)*.*

To go further we therefore assume that $q = 0$ and that the support of ν is contained in $[0, +\infty)$. It turns out that then the solution of the problem is related to the behavior of the distribution function

$$U_\nu(x) := \int_0^x y^2 \nu(dy), \qquad x \geq 0,$$

of the modified Lévy measure $y^2\nu(dy)$ near the origin. For the formulation we need the concept of slowly varying functions. A positive function M *varies slowly at* 0 if for any fixed $x > 0$

$$\frac{M(tx)}{M(t)} \longrightarrow 1, \qquad \text{as } t \longrightarrow 0.$$

Typical examples are constants or, for arbitrary γ and small positive t, functions

$$M(t) = \left(\ln \frac{1}{t}\right)^{\gamma} .$$

If M varies slowly at zero, then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ the following estimation holds, see Lemma 2 p.277 in [8],

$$t^{\varepsilon} < M(t) < t^{-\varepsilon} , \tag{3.1}$$

for all positive t sufficiently small. If

$$\frac{f(x)}{g(x)} \longrightarrow 1, \qquad \text{as } x \longrightarrow 0,$$

then we write $f(x) \sim g(x)$.

Theorem 3.2 *Assume that for some* $\rho \in (0, +\infty)$,

$$U_\nu(x) \sim x^\rho \cdot M(x), \qquad as\ x \to 0, \tag{3.2}$$

where M *is a slowly varying function at* 0.

i) If $\rho > 1$ *then there exists a bounded solution of* (2.2).

ii) If $\rho < 1$, *then there is no bounded solution of* (2.2).

iii) If $\rho = 1$, *the measure* ν *has a density and*

$$M(x) \longrightarrow 0 \quad as\ x \to 0, \quad and \quad \int_0^1 \frac{M(x)}{x}\, dx = +\infty, \tag{3.3}$$

then there exists a bounded solution of (2.2).

The following two characterizations are of independent interest and are crucial for the proofs of all the results presented above. We set $\mathbb{R}_+ = [0, +\infty)$.

Theorem 3.3 *Assume that*

$$\limsup_{z\to\infty} \left(\ln z - \bar{\lambda} T^* J'(z)\right) = +\infty. \tag{3.4}$$

i) Then there exists a bounded field $f : \mathcal{T} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ *which solves* (2.2).

ii) If, in addition, (2.11) *holds then the solution* f *is unique in the class of bounded fields.*

Theorem 3.4 *Assume that for some* $a > 0$, $b \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$J'(z) \geq a(\ln z)^3 + b, \qquad \forall z > 0. \tag{3.5}$$

For arbitrary $\kappa \in (0, 1)$, *there exists a positive constant* K *such that if*

$$f_0(T) > K, \quad \forall T \in [0, T^*], \tag{3.6}$$

then there is no solution $f : \mathcal{T} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ *of the equation* (2.2) *which is bounded with probability greater or equal than* κ.

The proof of Theorem 3.4 implies a result on locally bounded solutions. Namely, a locally bounded solution necessarily blows up in some point of the domain $\mathcal{T}$.

Theorem 3.5 *Let all the assumptions of Theorem 3.4 be satisfied. There exists a point $(x, y) \in \mathcal{T}$ such that if f is a solution of (2.2) which is bounded locally on $\mathcal{T}_{x,y}$ then*

$$\lim_{\mathcal{T}_{x,y} \ni (t,T) \to (x,y)} f(t,T) = +\infty$$

with probability greater or equal than κ.

4 Corollaries and comments

4.1 Existence of solutions and subordination

Subordinator is an increasing Lévy process. Its Lévy measure ν is concentrated on a positive half-line and satisfies condition

$$\int_0^1 y\nu(dy) < \infty, \tag{4.1}$$

see [1] Theorem 1.3.15 p.49 and [21] Proposition 21.7 p. 137. If L is subordinator then, as the proposition below states, the equation (2.2), has a bounded solution. However, (4.1) is not necessary for the existence as Example 4.2 shows. This way we answer a question posed by one of the reviewers.

Proposition 4.1 *If the process L is a sum of a subordinator and a linear function then (2.2) has a bounded solution. In particular if L is a compound Poisson process with a drift and positive jumps only then (2.2) has a bounded solution.*

Proof: By direct calculation we have

$$J'(z) = -a + \int_0^1 y(1 - e^{-zy})\nu(dy) - \int_1^\infty ye^{-zy}\nu(dy) \leq -a + \int_0^1 y\nu(dy).$$

Thus J' is a bounded function, therefore satisfies (3.4) and the result follows from Theorem 3.3. □

Example 4.2 *Let*

$$\nu(dy) = \frac{1}{y^2 \mid \ln y \mid^\gamma} \mathbf{1}_{(0,\frac{1}{2})}(y)dy$$

where $\gamma > 0$. Then the following hold.

a) There exists a bounded solution for any $\gamma > 0$.

b) $\int_0^1 y\nu(dy) < \infty \Longleftrightarrow \gamma > 1$.

Proof: We find J_2 explicitly. After some calculations we obtain

$$J_2(z) = \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} y(1 - e^{-zy}) \frac{1}{y^2 \mid \ln y \mid^\gamma} dy = \int_0^{\frac{z}{2}} \frac{1 - e^{-u}}{u} \cdot \frac{1}{\mid \ln \frac{u}{z} \mid^\gamma} du.$$

For large z we have

$$J_2(z) \le c \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{|\ln \frac{z}{u}\ |^\gamma} du + \int_{\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{z}{2}} \frac{1}{u} \cdot \frac{1}{|\ln \frac{z}{u}\ |^\gamma} du.$$

The first integral tends to 0 with $z \to +\infty$. The second can be written in the form

$$\int_{\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{z}{2}} \frac{1}{u} \cdot \frac{1}{|\ln \frac{z}{u}\ |^\gamma} du = \int_4^{2z} \frac{1}{v\ |\ln v\ |^\gamma} dv.$$

As a consequence

$$\lim_{z \to +\infty} \frac{J_2'(z)}{\ln z} = 0$$

and thus

$$\lim_{z \to +\infty} \big(\ln z - a J_2'(z)\big) = +\infty$$

for any $a > 0$. Thus (3.4) holds and solution exists. Checking (b) is straightforward. □

4.2 Comments on Theorem 3.2

We formulate two examples for which the conditions

$$M(x) \longrightarrow 0 \qquad \text{as } x \to 0, \tag{4.2}$$

$$\int_0^1 \frac{M(x)}{x}\, dx = +\infty, \tag{4.3}$$

are not simultaneously satisfied but the existence problem can be solved in virtue of Theorem 3.3.

Example 4.3 *Let ν be a measure with density*

$$\nu(dx) = \frac{1}{x^2} \cdot \frac{(\ln \frac{1}{x})^\gamma + \gamma(\ln \frac{1}{x})^{\gamma-1}}{(\ln \frac{1}{x})^{2\gamma}} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{(0,1)}(x), \qquad \gamma > 1.$$

Then it can be checked that the function U_ν is given by

$$U_\nu(x) = \int_0^x y^2 \cdot g(y) dy = x \cdot \frac{1}{(\ln \frac{1}{x})^\gamma}.$$

It is clear that the function

$$M(x) := \frac{1}{(\ln \frac{1}{x})^\gamma}, \quad \gamma > 1,$$

varies slowly at zero and that (4.2) *holds. However, condition* (4.3) *is not satisfied and thus Theorem 3.2 does not cover this case. We can explicitly show that J_2' is bounded and use Theorem 3.3. We have*

$$J_2'(z) = \int_0^1 y(1 - e^{-zy}) g(y) dy = \int_1^{+\infty} \frac{1 - e^{-\frac{z}{x}}}{x} \cdot \frac{(\ln x)^\gamma + \gamma(\ln x)^{\gamma-1}}{(\ln x)^{2\gamma}} dx$$

$$\le \int_1^{+\infty} \frac{1}{x} \cdot \frac{(\ln x)^\gamma + \gamma(\ln x)^{\gamma-1}}{(\ln x)^{2\gamma}} dx < +\infty.$$

Example 4.4 *Let ν be given by*

$$\nu(dy) = \frac{1}{y^{1+\rho}}\mathbf{1}_{(0,1)}(y)\ dy, \qquad \rho \in (0,2).$$

Then

a) if $\rho \in (1,2)$ then equation (2.2) has no bounded solutions,

b) if $\rho \in (0,1)$ or

c) $\rho = 1$ and $\bar{\lambda}T^* < 1$ then equation (2.2) has a bounded solution.

Proof: For $\rho \in (0,2)$ we have

$$U_\nu(x) = \frac{1}{2-\rho}x^{2-\rho}, \qquad x \in (0,1),$$

and thus (a) and (b) follows from Theorem 3.2. If $\rho = 1$ than (c) can not be deduced from Theorem 3.2 because the function $M(x) \equiv 1$ does not tend to zero. However, we have

$$J_2'(z) = \int_0^1 y(1-e^{-zy})\frac{1}{y^2}\ dy = \int_0^z \frac{1-e^{-v}}{\frac{v}{z}}\frac{1}{z}\ dv = \int_0^z \frac{1-e^{-v}}{v}\ dv,$$

and consequently

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} \frac{\ln z}{\bar{\lambda}T^* J_2'(z)} \overset{d'H}{=} \lim_{z\to\infty} \frac{\frac{1}{z}}{\frac{1-e^{-z}}{z}\cdot\bar{\lambda}T^*} = \lim_{z\to\infty} \frac{1}{\bar{\lambda}T^*(1-e^{-z})} = \frac{1}{\bar{\lambda}T^*} > 1.$$

This condition clearly implies (3.4) and (c) follows from Theorem 3.3. □

4.3 Integrable solutions

In the case when there is no solution of equation (2.2) in the class of bounded fields then one may ask if the solution does exist in a wider class of fields satisfying some integrability conditions. However, in some situations these two classes are the same. Assume, for instance, that the solution is supposed to satisfy the integrability condition

$$\int_0^{T^*} J'\left(\bar{\lambda}\int_0^{T^*} f(s,u)\ du\right) ds < \infty, \qquad P-a.s..$$

By Proposition 2.4 the function J' is increasing on $[0,+\infty)$, so is the nonnegative function $J'(\cdot)+\mid J'(0)\mid$. Consequently, for any $(t,T) \in \mathcal{T}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(t,T) &= e^{\int_0^t J'\left(\int_s^T f(s,u)\lambda(s,u)du\right)\lambda(s,T)ds}\cdot a(t,T) \\ &\le e^{\int_0^t \left(J'\left(\int_s^T f(s,u)\lambda(s,u)du\right)+|J'(0)|\right)\lambda(s,T)ds}\cdot a(t,T) \\ &\le e^{\bar{\lambda}\int_0^{T^*} J'\left(\bar{\lambda}\int_0^{T^*} f(s,u)du\right)ds+\bar{\lambda}T^*|J'(0)|}\cdot \sup_{(t,T)\in\mathcal{T}} a(t,T), \end{aligned}$$

so the boundedness of f follows from Proposition 2.3.

5 Proofs

This section consists of the proofs of all results presented in Section 3. They appear in the following order: proofs of Theorems 3.4 and 3.5, proof of Theorem 3.3 and proofs of Theorems 3.1 and 3.2.

5.1 Proof of Theorem 3.4

The proofs of Theorem 3.4 is preceded by a sequence of auxiliary lemmas and propositions.

Recall that the sets $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{x,y}$, where $0 < x \leq T^*$, $0 < y \leq T^*$ are given by (1.2) and (1.12). In the sequel we will use the notation: $\bar{\mathbb{R}}_+ := \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$.

In the following we will consider the function $h : \mathcal{T}_{x,y} \longrightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+$ given by

$$h(t,T) := e^{\varphi(t,T)}, \quad \text{where} \quad \varphi(t,T) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{x-t+y-T} & \text{for } (t,T) \neq (x,y) \\ \infty & \text{for } (t,T) = (x,y), \end{cases} \tag{5.1}$$

where $0 < x < y \leq T^*$ and the function $R_{\alpha,\gamma} : \mathbb{R}_+ \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ defined as

$$R_{\alpha,\gamma}(z) := \alpha \ln^3 \left(\gamma(z + e^2)\right), \qquad z \geq 0,\ \alpha > 0, \gamma \geq 1. \tag{5.2}$$

It can be verified that

$$d := R'_{\alpha,\gamma}(0) = \frac{3\alpha(2 + \ln \gamma)^2}{e^2},$$

and that $R_{\alpha,\gamma}$ is concave. Thus

$$|R_{\alpha,\gamma}(z_1) - R_{\alpha,\gamma}(z_2)| \leq d|z_1 - z_2|, \qquad z_1, z_2 \geq 0. \tag{5.3}$$

It can also be checked that for a constant $c > 0$ s.t. $\gamma(c \wedge 1) \geq 1$ we have

$$R_{\alpha,\gamma}(cz) \geq R_{\alpha,\gamma(c\wedge 1)}(z), \qquad z \geq 0. \tag{5.4}$$

Applying Jensen's inequality to the concave function $\ln^3(z + e^2)$ we obtain

$$\ln^3 \left(\frac{1}{b-a} \int_a^b f(x)dx + e^2\right) \geq \frac{1}{b-a} \int_a^b \ln^3 \left(f(x) + e^2\right) dx, \tag{5.5}$$

for any positive integrable function f on the interval (a, b), $a < b$.

Proposition 5.1 *Let $\alpha > 0$, $\gamma \geq 1$ be fixed constants such that $\alpha\gamma > 2$ and $\gamma T^* > 1$. Choose $(x, y) \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $0 < x < y < \frac{\alpha}{2} \wedge T^*$ and $\gamma(y - x) > 1$. Let the functions $h, R_{\alpha,\gamma}$ be given by (5.1) and (5.2) respectively. Then the function $g : \mathcal{T}_{x,y} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ defined by the formula*

$$g(t,T) := \begin{cases} e^{-\int_0^t R_{\alpha,\gamma}\left(\int_s^T h(s,u)du\right)ds} \cdot h(t,T) & \text{for } (t,T) \neq (x,y) \\ 0 & \text{for } (t,T) = (x,y) \end{cases} \tag{5.6}$$

is continuous.

Proof: We need to show continuity of g only in the point (x,y). Thus consider any point $(t,T)\in\mathcal{T}_{x,y}$ which is close to (x,y), i.e. s.t. $(t,T)\neq(x,y)$ and $\gamma(T-t)>1$. Using monotonicity of $R_{\alpha,\gamma}$ and (5.5) we obtain the following estimation

$$
\begin{aligned}
&e^{-\int_0^t R_{\alpha,\gamma}\left(\int_s^T h(s,u)du\right)ds}\cdot h(t,T)=e^{-\alpha\int_0^t \ln^3\left(\gamma(\int_s^T h(s,u)du+e^2)\right)ds}\cdot h(t,T)\\
&\leq e^{-\alpha\int_0^t \ln^3\left(\gamma\int_s^T h(s,u)du+e^2\right)ds}\cdot h(t,T)\leq e^{-\alpha\int_0^t \ln^3\left(\frac{\gamma(T-t)}{T-s}\int_s^T h(s,u)du+e^2\right)ds}\cdot h(t,T)\\
&\leq e^{-\alpha\int_0^t \ln^3\left(\frac{1}{T-s}\int_s^T h(s,u)du+e^2\right)ds}\cdot h(t,T)\leq e^{-\alpha\int_0^t \frac{1}{T-s}\int_s^T \ln^3(h(s,u)+e^2)duds}\cdot h(t,T)\\
&\leq e^{-\frac{\alpha}{T}\int_0^t\int_s^T \ln^3 h(s,u)duds}\cdot h(t,T)=e^{-\frac{\alpha}{T}\int_0^t\int_s^T \varphi^3(s,u)duds+\varphi(t,T)}.
\end{aligned}
$$

One can check that

$$
\int_0^t\int_s^T \frac{1}{(x-s+y-u)^3}\,du\,ds=\frac{t}{2}\cdot\frac{-T^2-Tt-ty+2Ty+2Tx-tx}{(x-t+y-T)(x+y-2t)(x+y-T)(x+y)},
$$

and thus

$$
-\frac{\alpha}{T}\int_0^t\int_s^T \varphi^3(s,u)duds+\varphi(t,T)=\left(1-\frac{\alpha t\left(-T^2-Tt-ty+2Ty+2Tx-tx\right)}{2T(x+y-2t)(x+y-T)(x+y)}\right)\varphi(t,T).
$$

Passing to the limit we obtain

$$
\lim_{t\to x,T\to y}(-T^2-Tt-ty+2Ty+2Tx-tx)=y^2-x^2,
$$

$$
\lim_{t\to x,T\to y}(x+y-2t)=y-x,\qquad \lim_{t\to x,T\to y}(x+y-T)=x.
$$

Hence

$$
\lim_{t\to x,T\to y}\left(1-\frac{\alpha t\left(-T^2-Tt-ty+2Ty+2Tx-tx\right)}{2T(x-t+y-T)(x+y-2t)(x+y-T)(x+y)}\right)=1-\frac{\alpha}{2y}<0,
$$

and consequently $\lim_{t\to x,T\to y} g(t,T)=0$. □

Remark 5.2 *The functions $h, R_{\alpha,\gamma}, g$ in Proposition 5.1 satisfy the equation*

$$
h(t,T)=e^{\int_0^t R_{\alpha,\gamma}\left(\int_s^T h(s,u)du\right)ds}\cdot g(t,T),\qquad \forall(t,T)\in\mathcal{T}_{x,y}.
$$

Lemma 5.3 *Let $0<t_0\leq T_0<\infty$ and define a set*

$$
A:=\Big\{(t,T): t\leq T,\ 0\leq t\leq t_0,\ t\leq T\leq T_0\Big\}.
$$

If $d: A\longrightarrow\mathbb{R}_+$ is a bounded function satisfying

$$
d(t,T)\leq K\int_0^t\int_s^T d(s,u)duds\qquad \forall(t,T)\in A \tag{5.7}
$$

where $0<K<\infty$ then $d(t,T)\equiv 0$ on A.

Proof: Assume that d is bounded by a constant $M > 0$ on A. We show inductively that

$$d(t,T) \leq MK^n \frac{(tT)^n}{(n!)^2}, \qquad \forall (t,T) \in A. \tag{5.8}$$

The formula (5.8) is valid for $n = 0$. Assume that it is true for some n and show that it is true for $n+1$. We have the following estimation

$$\begin{aligned} d(t,T) &\leq K \int_0^t \int_s^T MK^n \frac{(su)^n}{(n!)^2} du ds = MK^{n+1} \frac{1}{(n!)^2} \int_0^t s^n (\int_s^T u^n du) ds \\ &= MK^{n+1} \frac{1}{(n!)^2} \int_0^t s^n \left(\frac{T^{n+1} - s^{n+1}}{n+1} \right) ds \leq MK^{n+1} \frac{1}{(n!)^2} \int_0^t s^n \frac{T^{n+1}}{n+1} ds \\ &= MK^{n+1} \frac{1}{(n!)^2} \frac{t^{n+1}}{(n+1)} \frac{T^{n+1}}{(n+1)} = MK^{n+1} \frac{(tT)^{n+1}}{((n+1)!)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $n \longrightarrow \infty$ in (5.8) we see that $d(t,T) = 0$. □

Proposition 5.4 *Fix $\alpha > 0$, $\gamma \geq 1$ s.t. $\alpha\gamma > 2$ and $\gamma T^* > 1$. Let $0 < x < y < \frac{\alpha}{2} \wedge T^*$, $\gamma(y-x) > 1$, $0 < \delta < y$ and $g : \mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a bounded function. Assume that there exists a bounded function $h : \mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ which solves the following equation*

$$h(t,T) = e^{\int_0^t R_{\alpha,\gamma}\left(\int_s^T h(s,u)du\right)ds} \cdot g(t,T), \qquad \forall (t,T) \in \mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta}, \tag{5.9}$$

where $R_{\alpha,\gamma}$ is given by (5.2)*. Then h is uniquely determined in the class of bounded functions on $\mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta}$.*

Proof: Assume that $h_1, h_2 : \mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ are bounded solutions of (5.9). Then the function $\mid h_1 - h_2 \mid$ is bounded and satisfies

$$\mid h_1(t,T) - h_2(t,T) \mid \leq \parallel g \parallel \cdot \mid e^{\int_0^t R_{\alpha,\gamma}\left(\int_s^T h_1(s,u)du\right)ds} - e^{\int_0^t R_{\alpha,\gamma}\left(\int_s^T h_2(s,u)du\right)ds} \mid, \quad \forall (t,T) \in \mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta},$$

where

$$\parallel g \parallel = \sup_{(t,T) \in \mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta}} \mid g(t,T) \mid .$$

As a consequence of the inequality $\mid e^x - e^y \mid \leq \max\{e^x, e^y\} \mid x - y \mid$ for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\mid h_1(t,T) - h_2(t,T) \mid \leq K \int_0^t \left| R_{\alpha,\gamma}\left(\int_s^T h_1(s,u)du\right) - R_{\alpha,\gamma}\left(\int_s^T h_2(s,u)du\right) \right| ds, \quad \forall (t,T) \in \mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta},$$

where

$$K := \parallel g \parallel \sup_{(t,T) \in \mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta}} \max_{i=1,2} \left\{ e^{\int_0^t R_{\alpha,\gamma}\left(\int_s^T h_i(s,u)du\right)ds} \right\} < \infty.$$

In virtue of (5.3) we have

$$\mid h_1(t,T) - h_2(t,T) \mid \leq dK \int_0^t \int_s^T \mid h_1(s,u) - h_2(s,u) \mid du ds, \qquad \forall (t,T) \in \mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta}.$$

In view of Lemma 5.3, with $t_0 = \min\{x, y-\delta\}$, $T_0 = y - \delta$, we have $h_1(t,T) = h_2(t,T)$ for all $(t,T) \in \mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta}$. □

Proposition 5.5 *Fix $\alpha > 0$, $\gamma \geq 1$ s.t. $\alpha\gamma > 2$, $\gamma T^* > 1$ and the function $R_{\alpha,\gamma}$ given by (5.2). Choose (x, y) s.t. $0 < x < y < \frac{\alpha}{2} \wedge T^*$, $\gamma(y-x) > 1$ and δ s.t. $0 < \delta < y$. Let $f_1 : \mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, where be a bounded function satisfying inequality*

$$f_1(t,T) \geq e^{\int_0^t R_{\alpha,\gamma}\left(\int_s^T f_1(s,u)du\right)ds} \cdot g_1(t,T), \qquad \forall (t,T) \in \mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta}, \tag{5.10}$$

where $g_1 : \mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$. Let $f_2 : \mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a bounded function solving equation

$$f_2(t,T) = e^{\int_0^t R_{\alpha,\gamma}\left(\int_s^T f_2(s,u)du\right)ds} \cdot g_2(t,T), \qquad \forall (t,T) \in \mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta}, \tag{5.11}$$

where $g_2 : \mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a bounded function. Moreover, assume that

$$g_1(t,T) \geq g_2(t,T) \geq 0, \qquad \forall (t,T) \in \mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta}. \tag{5.12}$$

Then $f_1(t,T) \geq f_2(t,T)$ for all $(t,T) \in \mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta}$.

Proof: Let us define the operator $\mathcal{K}$ acting on bounded functions on $\mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta}$ by

$$\mathcal{K}k(t,T) := e^{\int_0^t R_{\alpha,\gamma}\left(\int_s^T k(s,u)du\right)ds} \cdot g_2(t,T), \qquad (t,T) \in \mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta}. \tag{5.13}$$

Let us notice that in view of (5.10),(5.12) and (5.13) we have

$$\mathcal{K}f_1(t,T) \leq e^{\int_0^t R_{\alpha,\gamma}\left(\int_s^T f_1(s,u)du\right)ds} \cdot g_1(t,T) \leq f_1(t,T), \qquad \forall (t,T) \in \mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta}. \tag{5.14}$$

It is clear that the operator $\mathcal{K}$ is order-preserving, i.e.

$$k_1(t,T) \leq k_2(t,T) \quad \forall (t,T) \in \mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \mathcal{K}k_1(t,T) \leq \mathcal{K}k_2(t,T) \quad \forall (t,T) \in \mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta}. \tag{5.15}$$

Let us consider the sequence of functions: $f_1, \mathcal{K}f_1, \mathcal{K}^2 f_1, \ldots$. In virtue of (5.14) and (5.15) we see that $f_1 \geq \mathcal{K}f_1 \geq \mathcal{K}^2 f_1 \geq \ldots$ .Thus this sequence is pointwise convergent to some function $\bar{f}$ and it is bounded by f_1, so applying the dominated convergence theorem in the formula

$$\mathcal{K}^{n+1} f_1(t,T) = e^{\int_0^t R_{\alpha,\gamma}\left(\int_s^T \mathcal{K}^n f_1(s,u)du\right)ds} \cdot g_2(t,T), \qquad \forall (t,T) \in \mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta}$$

we obtain

$$\bar{f}(t,T) = e^{\int_0^t R_{\alpha,\gamma}\left(\int_s^T \bar{f}(s,u)du\right)ds} \cdot g_2(t,T), \qquad \forall (t,T) \in \mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta}.$$

Moreover, $\bar{f}$ is bounded and thus, in view of Proposition 5.4, we have $\bar{f} = f_2$. As a consequence $f_1 \geq f_2$ on $\mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta}$. □

Proof of Theorem 3.4
Let us notice that for $0 < \tilde{\alpha} < a$ and any $\tilde{\gamma} \geq 1$ we have

$$\lim_{z \to +\infty} \frac{\tilde{\alpha} \ln^3\left(\tilde{\gamma}(z + e^2)\right)}{a \ln^3 z} = \frac{\tilde{\alpha}}{a} < 1.$$

Thus (3.5) implies that for $0 < \tilde{\alpha} < a$ and any $\tilde{\gamma} \geq 1$ there exists $\tilde{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$J'(z) \geq \tilde{\alpha} \ln^3\left(\tilde{\gamma}(z + e^2)\right) + \tilde{\beta} = R_{\tilde{\alpha},\tilde{\gamma}}(z) + \tilde{\beta}, \qquad z \geq 0. \tag{5.16}$$

Now fix parameters $\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\gamma}$ so that they satisfy

$$0 < \tilde{\alpha} < a, \quad \tilde{\gamma} \geq 1, \quad \tilde{\gamma}(\underline{\lambda} \wedge 1) \geq 1, \quad \underline{\lambda}\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\gamma}(\underline{\lambda} \wedge 1) > 2, \quad \tilde{\gamma}(\underline{\lambda} \wedge 1)T^* > 1,$$

and $\tilde{\beta}$ s.t. (5.16) holds.

Assume that there exists a bounded solution of (2.2). Using (5.16), (2.1) and (5.4) the forward rate f satisfies the following inequality

$$f(t,T) = e^{\int_0^t J'(\int_s^T \lambda(s,u)f(s,u)du)\lambda(s,T)ds} a(t,T) \geq e^{\int_0^t R_{\tilde{\alpha},\tilde{\gamma}}\left(\int_s^T \lambda(s,u)f(s,u)du\right)\lambda(s,T)ds+\tilde{\beta}t} a(t,T)$$

$$\geq e^{\underline{\lambda}\int_0^t R_{\tilde{\alpha},\tilde{\gamma}}\left(\underline{\lambda}\int_s^T f(s,u)du\right)ds} e^{\tilde{\beta}t} a(t,T) \geq e^{\int_0^t R_{\underline{\lambda}\tilde{\alpha},\tilde{\gamma}(\underline{\lambda}\wedge 1)}\left(\int_s^T f(s,u)du\right)ds} e^{\tilde{\beta}t} a(t,T)$$

$$= e^{\int_0^t R_{\alpha,\gamma}\left(\int_s^T f(s,u)du\right)ds} e^{\tilde{\beta}t} a(t,T). \tag{5.17}$$

The constants above $\alpha := \underline{\lambda}\tilde{\alpha}$, $\gamma := \tilde{\gamma}(\underline{\lambda} \wedge 1)$ satisfy $\alpha > 0$, $\gamma \geq 1$, $\alpha\gamma > 2$, $\gamma T^* > 1$. Choose $(x,y) \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $0 < x < y < \frac{\alpha}{2} \wedge T^*$, $\gamma(y-x) > 1$ and fix three deterministic functions $h : \mathcal{T}_{x,y} \longrightarrow \bar{\mathbb{R}}_+$, $R_{\alpha,\gamma} : \mathbb{R}_+ \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, $g : \mathcal{T}_{x,y} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ given by (5.1), (5.2) and (5.6) respectively. Recall that, due to Remark 5.2, they satisfy the equation

$$h(t,T) = e^{\int_0^t R_{\alpha,\gamma}\left(\int_s^T h(s,u)du\right)ds} \cdot g(t,T), \qquad \forall (t,T) \in \mathcal{T}_{x,y}. \tag{5.18}$$

In virtue of Proposition 5.1 the function g is continuous on $\mathcal{T}_{x,y}$ and thus bounded. It follows from Proposition 2.3 that if the constant K is sufficiently large, then with probability arbitrarily close to 1,

$$e^{\tilde{\beta}t} a(t,T) \geq g(t,T), \qquad \forall (t,T) \in \mathcal{T}_{x,y}. \tag{5.19}$$

Let us fix $0 < \delta < y$ and consider inequality (5.17) and equality (5.18) on the set $\mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta}$. Then the function h is continuous. In virtue of Proposition 5.5 we have

$$f(t,T) \geq h(t,T) = e^{\frac{1}{(x-t+y-T)}}, \qquad \forall (t,T) \in \mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta}.$$

For any sequence $(t_n, T_n) \in \mathcal{T}_{x,y}$ satisfying $t_n \uparrow x$, $T_n \uparrow y$ define a sequence $\delta_n := \frac{y-T_n}{2}$. Then

$$f(t,T) \geq e^{\frac{1}{(x-t+y-T)}}, \qquad \forall (t,T) \in \mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta_n},$$

and consequently $\lim_{n\to\infty} f(t_n,T_n) = +\infty$ what is a contradiction with the assumption that f is bounded. □

5.2 Proof of Theorem 3.5

From the fact that f is a locally bounded solution on $\mathcal{T}_{x,y}$ we have, as in the proof of Theorem 3.4, that

$$f(t,T) \geq h(t,T), \qquad \forall (t,T) \in \mathcal{T}_{x,y-\delta},$$

for each $0 < \delta < y$. As a consequence

$$\lim_{\mathcal{T}_{x,y} \ni (t,T) \to (T^*,T^*)} f(t,T) = +\infty.$$

□

5.3 Proof of Theorem 3.3

The proof of Theorem 3.3 is preceded by the auxiliary result.

We can write (2.2) in the form $f = \mathcal{A}f$, where

$$\mathcal{A}h(t,T) := a(t,T) \cdot e^{\int_0^t J'\left(\int_s^T \lambda(s,u)h(s,u)du\right)\lambda(s,T)ds}, \qquad (t,T) \in \mathcal{T}. \tag{5.20}$$

The proof of Theorem 3.3 is based on the properties of the operator $\mathcal{A}$. If we fix $\omega \in \Omega$ then we can treat $\mathcal{A}$ as a purely deterministic transformation with the function a positive and bounded.

Proposition 5.6 *Assume that the function J' satisfies* (3.4)*. Then there exists a positive constant c such that if*

$$h(t,T) \leq c, \quad \forall (t,T) \in \mathcal{T},$$

for a non-negative function h, then

$$\mathcal{A}h(t,T) \leq c, \quad \forall (t,T) \in \mathcal{T}. \tag{5.21}$$

Proof: Let us assume that $h(t,T) \leq c$ for all $(t,T) \in \mathcal{T}$ for some positive c. Using the fact that J' is increasing and λ positive, we have

$$\mathcal{A}h(t,T) \leq a(t,T) \cdot e^{J'(\bar{\lambda}cT^*)\int_0^t \lambda(s,T)ds}$$

By Proposition 2.3 $a(\cdot,\cdot)$ is bounded by a positive constant $K = K(\omega)$ and we arrive at the following inequality

$$\mathcal{A}h(t,T) \leq Ke^{J'(\bar{\lambda}cT^*)\int_0^t \lambda(s,T)ds}, \ (t,T) \in \mathcal{T}.$$

It is therefore enough to find a positive constant c such that

$$\ln K + J'(\bar{\lambda}cT^*) \cdot \int_0^t \lambda(s,T)ds \leq \ln c, \ (t,T) \in \mathcal{T}.$$

If the function J' is negative on $[0,+\infty)$ then it is enough to take $c = K$. If J' takes positive values then it is enough to find a positive an arbitrarily large constant c such that

$$\ln K + \bar{\lambda}T^* \cdot J'(\bar{\lambda}cT^*) \leq \ln c, \ (t,T) \in \mathcal{T}.$$

Existence of such c is an immediate consequence of the assumption (3.4). □

Proof of Theorem 3.3

i) The operator $\mathcal{A}$ is order-preserving, i.e.

$$h_1 \leq h_2 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \mathcal{A}h_1 \leq \mathcal{A}h_2.$$

The sequence $h_0 \equiv 0, \ h_{n+1} := \mathcal{A}h_n$ is thus monotonically increasing to $\bar{h}$ and by the monotone convergence theorem we have

$$\bar{h}(t,T) = \mathcal{A}\bar{h}(t,T), \qquad \forall (t,T) \in \mathcal{T}.$$

Moreover, since $h_0 \leq c$, where $c = c(\omega)$ is given by Proposition 5.6, $\bar{h}$ is bounded and thus (1.11) is satisfied. Moreover, by the boundedness of $\bar{h}$ it follows that the process

$$\int_0^t J'\Big(\int_s^T \lambda(s,u)\bar{h}(s,u)du\Big)\lambda(s,T)ds \tag{5.22}$$

is continuous wrt. $(t,T)\in\mathcal{T}$ for fixed ω. It is also adapted wrt. t. If we replace $\bar{h}(s,u)$ in the above formula by any bounded field $k(s,u)$ which is adapted wrt. s then (5.22) becomes adapted wrt. t. As a consequence, $\bar{h}(\cdot,T)$ is adapted as a limit of the adapted sequence $\{h_n(\cdot,T)\}$. In virtue of Proposition 2.3, the field $\bar{h}$ satisfies (1.9) and (1.10).
ii) The function J' is Lipschitz on $[0,+\infty)$ and therefore we can repeat all arguments from the proof of Proposition 5.4 and the result follows. □

5.4 Proof of Theorem 3.1

If $q>0$ then J' satisfies

$$J'(z)\geq -a+qz+J_3'(0),\qquad z\geq 0.$$

If $\nu\{(-\frac{1}{\lambda},0)\}>0$ then

$$J'(z)\geq -a+J_1'(z)+J_3'(0),\qquad z\geq 0,$$

and due to the formula

$$J_1'''(z)=-\int_{-1/\bar{\lambda}}^{0} y^3e^{-zy}\ \nu(dy)\geq 0,$$

J_1' is convex and as such it satisfies the inequality

$$J_1'(z)\geq J_1''(0)z+J_1'(0).$$

In both cases (3.5) holds and thus the assertion follows from Theorem 3.4. □

5.5 Proof of Theorem 3.2

The following proposition will be useful in the proof of Theorem 3.2.

Proposition 5.7 *The following conditions are equivalent*

i) $\int_0^1 y\nu(dy)=+\infty$,

ii) $\lim_{z\to\infty}J_2'(z)=+\infty$.

Moreover, if the measure ν has a density and

$$U_\nu(x)\sim x\cdot M(x),\quad \text{as } x\to 0, \tag{5.23}$$

where M is such that $M(x)\to c>0$ as $x\to 0$, then each of the conditions above is equivalent to iii) $\int_0^1\frac{M(x)}{x}dx=+\infty$.

Proof: Equivalence of (i) and (ii) follows directly from the dominated convergence theorem. We show equivalence of (i) and (iii). In virtue of (5.23) we have

$$c\int_0^1\frac{U_\nu(x)}{x^2}dx\leq\int_0^1\frac{M(x)}{x}dx\leq C\int_0^1\frac{U_\nu(x)}{x^2}dx$$

for some constants $0 < c < C$. We show that (i) holds iff the last integral diverges. Integrating by parts yields

$$\int_0^1 \frac{U_\nu(x)}{x^2}dx = \int_0^1 \left(\int_0^x y^2 g(y)dy\right)\cdot\frac{1}{x^2}dx = \left(-\frac{1}{x}\int_0^x y^2 g(y)dy\right)\Big|_0^1 + \int_0^1 yg(y)dy$$

$$= \lim_{x\to 0} M(x) - \int_0^1 y^2 g(y)dy + \int_0^1 yg(y)dy = c + \int_0^1 y^2\nu(dy) + \int_0^1 y\nu(dy),$$

where g is a density of ν. □

Proof of Theorem 3.2
Fix $\rho \in (0, +\infty)$. Let us notice that

$$J_2''(z) = \int_0^1 y^2 e^{-zy}\nu(dy) = \int_0^1 e^{-zy}\mu(dy)$$

is a Laplace transform of the measure $y^2\nu(dy)$. Thus it follows from Tauberian theorem, see Theorem 2 p.445 in [8], that the condition (3.2) is equivalent to

$$\lim_{z\to\infty}\frac{J_2''(z)}{\Gamma(\rho+1)z^{-\rho}\cdot M(\frac{1}{z})} = 1, \tag{5.24}$$

where Γ stands for the gamma function.
$i)$ $\rho > 1$
Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\rho - \varepsilon > 1$. Using(3.1) we can find $z_0 > 0$ such that $M(\frac{1}{z}) < z^\varepsilon$ for all $z > z_0$. In virtue of (5.24) for any $z > z_0$ we have the following estimation

$$J_2'(z) \le J_2'(z_0) + 2\int_{z_0}^z v^{-\rho} M\left(\frac{1}{v}\right)dv$$

$$\le J_2'(z_0) + 2\int_{z_0}^{+\infty} v^{\varepsilon-\rho}dv < +\infty.$$

Thus condition (3.4) holds because

$$J'(z) = -a + J_2'(z) + J_3'(z), \qquad z \ge 0,$$

and J_2' is a bounded function. The assertion follows from Theorem 3.3.

To prove (ii) and (iii) let us notice that in view of Proposition 5.7 we have

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} J_2'(z) = +\infty.$$

As a consequence of (3.1) in the case when $\rho \in (0,1)$ and the assumption (4.3) if $\rho = 1$, we have

$$\lim_{z\to\infty}\int_a^z v^{-\rho}\cdot M\left(\frac{1}{v}\right)dv = +\infty, \qquad \rho \in (0,1],$$

for any $a > 0$. Thus from d'Hospital formula it follows that for any $a > 0$ we have

$$\lim_{z\to\infty}\frac{J_2'(z)}{\Gamma(\rho+1)\int_a^z v^{-\rho}\cdot M(\frac{1}{v})dv} = \lim_{z\to\infty}\frac{J_2''(z)}{\Gamma(\rho+1)\ z^{-\rho}\cdot M(\frac{1}{z})} = 1, \qquad \rho \in (0,1].$$

ii) $\rho \in (0,1)$

Fix any $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\rho + \varepsilon < 1$. By (3.1) we can find a constant $a > 0$ such that for any $v > a$ we have $M(\frac{1}{v}) > v^{-\varepsilon}$. Then for z sufficiently large the following estimation holds

$$\begin{aligned} J_2'(z) &\geq (1-\varepsilon)\Gamma(\rho+1)\int_a^z v^{-\rho} M(\frac{1}{v})dv \\ &\geq (1-\varepsilon)\Gamma(\rho+1)\int_a^z v^{-\rho}v^{-\varepsilon}dv \\ &= \frac{(1-\varepsilon)\Gamma(\rho+1)}{1-(\rho+\varepsilon)}\left(z^{1-(\rho+\varepsilon)} - a^{1-(\rho+\varepsilon)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, J' satisfies (3.5) and the assertion follows from Theorem 3.4.

i) $\rho = 1$

Let $c > 0$ be any positive constant. Using (4.2) we can fix a constant $a > 0$ such that

$$0 < 1 - 2c \max_{v\in[a,\infty]} M\left(\frac{1}{v}\right) < 1.$$

For large z satisfying

$$\frac{J_2'(z)}{\int_a^z \frac{1}{v}\cdot M(\frac{1}{v})dv} \leq 2,$$

we have the following estimation

$$\begin{aligned} \ln z - cJ_2'(z) &= \ln z - c\frac{J_2'(z)}{\int_a^z \frac{1}{v}\cdot M\left(\frac{1}{v}\right)dv}\int_a^z \frac{1}{v}\cdot M\left(\frac{1}{v}\right)dv \\ &\geq \ln z - 2c\int_a^z \frac{1}{v}\cdot M\left(\frac{1}{v}\right)dv \\ &\geq \ln z - 2c[\ln z - \ln a]\max_{v\in[a,z]} M\left(\frac{1}{v}\right) \\ &\geq \left(1 - 2c\max_{v\in[a,\infty]} M\left(\frac{1}{v}\right)\right)\ln z + 2c\ln a\cdot \max_{v\in[a,\infty]} M\left(\frac{1}{v}\right) \underset{z\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus condition (3.4) holds because

$$J'(z) = -a + J_2'(z) + J_3'(z), \qquad z \geq 0$$

and J_2' is a bounded function. The assertion follows from Theorem 3.3. □

References

[1] Applebaum, D.: Lévy Processes and Stochastic Calculus, Cambridge University Press (2004)

[2] Barski, M., Zabczyk, J.: Heath-Jarrow-Morton-Musiela equation with Lévy perturbation, Journal of Differential Equations, **253**, 9, 2657-2697 (2012)

[3] Björk, Th., Di Masi, G., Kabanov, Y., Runggaldier, W.: Towards a general theory of bond markets, Finance and Stochastics **1**, 141-174 (1997)

[4] Bertoin, J.: Lévy Processes, Cambridge University Press (1996)

[5] Brace, A., Gatarek, D., Musiela, M.: The market model of interest rate dynamics, Mathematical Finance **7**, 127-147 (1997)

[6] Brzeźniak, Z., Peszat, Sz., Zabczyk, J.: Continuity of stochastic convolutions, Czech. Math. J. **51**, 679-684 (2001)

[7] Eberlein, E., Raible, S.: Term structure models driven by general Lévy processes, Mathematical Finance **9**, 31-53 (1999)

[8] Feller W.: An Introduction to Probability Theory and Its Applications, John Willey and Sons (1970)

[9] Filpović, D.: Term-Structure Models: A Graduate Course, Springer-Verlag (2009)

[10] Filpović, D., Tappe, S.: Existence of Lévy term structure models, Finance and Stochastics **12**, 83-115 (2008)

[11] Filpović, D., Tappe, S., Teichmann, J. : Term structure models driven by Wiener process and Poisson measures: Existence and positivity, SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics, **1**, 523-554 (2010)

[12] Heath, D., Jarrow, R., Morton, A.: Bond pricing and the term structure of interest rates: a new methodology for contingent claim valuation, Econometrica **60**, 77-105 (1992)

[13] Jakubowski, J., Zabczyk J.: Exponential moments for HJM models with jumps, Finance and Stochastics **11**, 429-445 (2007)

[14] Kwapień, S., Marcus, M.B., Rosiński J.: Two results on continuity and boundness of stochastic convolutions, Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré (B) Probabilités et Statistiques **42**, 5, 553-566 (2006)

[15] Marinelli, C.: Local well-posedness of Musiela's SPDE with Lévy noise, Mathematical Finance **20**, 341-363 (2010)

[16] Morton, A.: Arbitrage and martingales, Dissertation, Cornell University (1989)

[17] Peszat, Sz., Zabczyk, J.: Heath-Jarrow-Morton-Musiela equation of bond market, Preprint IMPAN 677 (2007), www.impan.pl/Preprints/p677.pdf

[18] Peszat, Sz., Zabczyk, J.: Stochastic partial differential equations with Lévy noise, Cambridge University Press (2007)

[19] Protter, P.: Stochastic integration and differential equations, Springer (2005)

[20] Rusinek, A.: Invariant measures for forward rate HJM model with Lèvy noise, Preprint IMPAN 669 (2006), http://www.impan.pl/Preprints/p669.pdf,

[21] Sato, K.I.: Lévy Processes and Infinite Divisible Distributions, Cambridge University Press (1999)